



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/732,909	12/10/2003	Ira Marlow	99879-00006	6895
27614	7590	10/03/2007	EXAMINER	
MCCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP FOUR GATEWAY CENTER 100 MULBERRY STREET NEWARK, NJ 07102			KURR, JASON RICHARD	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2615		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/03/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/732,909	MARLOW, IRA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason R. Kurr	2615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5,7,9,10,12-19 and 22-41 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7,9,10,12-19 and 22-41 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/7/07.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 7, 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9,12, 14-15, 21, 24, 26-30, 32, 35-37, 39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falcon (US 6,993,615 B2) in view of Miyazaki et al (US 6,163,079).

With respect to claim 1, Falcon discloses a docking station for docking and integrating a portable device (fig.2,4 #102) for use with a car stereo (fig.1 #108, fig.4 #200, col.2 ln.48-51), comprising: a base portion for receiving a portable device external

to a car stereo; a bottom member connected to the base portion and defining a cavity for receiving a portable device (col.3 ln.41-49); and an integration device (fig.2 #142) positioned within the base portion for integrating a portable device with a car stereo (col.3 ln.34-40). As described by Falcon in column 3 lines 41-49, the portable computing device is capable of being docked to an appliance in a number of assorted ways, wherein one of these ways includes inserting the device in a recessed portion of the appliance. A recessed portion would include a base portion with surrounding walls (bottom and top members) for surrounding the portable device. This can be seen in figure 4 of Falcon, wherein the portable device (#102) is docked within a recessed portion of the appliance (#200).

Falcon does not disclose expressly wherein the docking station is positioned remotely from the car stereo.

Miyazaki discloses a system for docking portable audio devices (fig.2 #40A) to a car stereo (fig.1 #32) wherein the docking stations (fig.1 #38) are positioned in remote locations from the car stereo.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use multiple docking stations placed at various remote locations as disclosed by Miyazaki to dock the portable audio device of Falcon to the car stereo.

The motivation for using multiple remote docking stations in various locations would have been to allow a passenger in the rear of the vehicle to control the audio of the car stereo by placing the portable audio device in a docking station adjacent to the rear seats.

With respect to claim 3, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the base portion comprises a connector for connecting the integration device with the portable device (col.3 ln.43-46).

With respect to claim 7, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the portable device comprises a CD player, CD changer, MP3 player, Digital Audio Broadcast (DAB) receiver, portable video device, or a satellite receiver (col.6 ln.41-47).

With respect to claim 9, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the integration device comprises a circuit board housed in the base portion (col.3 ln.34-40). It is implicit that the I/O component (#142) would contain a circuit board for the attachment of the disclosed hardware in Falcon column 3 lines 37-38.

With respect to claim 12, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the integration device is connected to the car stereo using a bus connection (col.6 ln.37-41).

With respect to claims 14 and 41, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 1, further comprising one or more auxiliary input ports connected to the integration device for integrating additional portable devices external to the docking station (col.7 ln.1-4).

With respect to claim 15, Falcon discloses a method for docking and integrating a portable device (fig.2,4 #102) for use with a car stereo (fig.4 #200), comprising: providing a docking station having a base portion, a bottom member connected to the base portion, and an integration device (fig.2 #142) housed within the base portion (col.2 ln.48-51, col.3 ln.41-49); inserting a portable device into the docking station and connecting the portable audio device to a connector on the base portion (col.3 ln.43-46); and integrating the portable device with the integration device for use with a car stereo (col.3 ln.34-40). As described by Falcon in column 3 lines 41-49, the portable computing device is capable of being docked to an appliance in a number of assorted ways, wherein one of these ways includes inserting the device in a recessed portion of the appliance. A recessed portion would include a base portion with surrounding walls (bottom and top members) for surrounding the portable device. This can be seen in figure 4 of Falcon, wherein the portable device (#102) is docked within a recessed portion of the appliance (#200).

Falcon does not disclose expressly wherein the docking station is positioned remotely from the car stereo.

Miyazaki discloses a system for docking portable audio devices (fig.2 #40A) to a car stereo (fig.1 #32) wherein the docking stations (fig.1 #38) are positioned in remote locations from the car stereo.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use multiple docking stations placed at various remote locations as disclosed by Miyazaki to dock the portable audio device of Falcon to the car stereo.

The motivation for using multiple remote docking stations in various locations would have been to allow a passenger in the rear of the vehicle to control the audio of the car stereo by placing the portable audio device in a docking station adjacent to the rear seats.

With respect to claim 21, Falcon discloses the method of claim 15, further comprising integrating a CD player, CD changer, MP3 player, Digital Audio Broadcast (DAB) receiver, a portable video device, or a satellite receiver with the car stereo (col.6 ln.41-47).

With respect to claim 24, Falcon discloses the method of claim 15, further comprising connecting the integration device to the car stereo using a bus connection (col.6 ln.37-41).

With respect to claim 26, Falcon discloses the method of claim 15, further comprising connecting an external portable device to an auxiliary input port on the docking station and integrating the external portable device with the car stereo (col.7 ln.1-4).

With respect to claim 27, Falcon discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the docking station is mountable within a vehicle (col.2 ln.48-51).

With respect to claim 28, Falcon discloses the method of claim 15, further comprising mounting the docking station in a vehicle (col.2 ln.48-51).

With respect to claim 29, Falcon discloses the method of claim 28 in view of Miyazaki, further comprising mounting the docking station in a vehicle trunk (Miyazaki: fig.1 #38).

With respect to claim 30, Falcon discloses a docking station for docking and integrating a portable device (fig.2,4 #102) for use with a car stereo (fig.4 #200), comprising: a base portion for receiving a portable device external to a car stereo; a bottom member connected to the base portion and defining a cavity for receiving a portable device (col.3 ln.41-49); and an integration device (fig.2 #142) connected to the base portion and in electrical communication with a car stereo and a portable device for integrating a portable device with a car stereo (col.3 ln.34-40). As described by Falcon in column 3 lines 41-49, the portable computing device is capable of being docked to an appliance in a number of assorted ways, wherein one of these ways includes inserting the device in a recessed portion of the appliance. A recessed portion would include a base portion with surrounding walls (bottom and top members) for surrounding the portable device. This can be seen in figure 4 of Falcon, wherein the portable device (#102) is docked within a recessed portion of the appliance (#200).

Falcon does not disclose expressly wherein the docking station is positioned remotely from the car stereo.

Miyazaki discloses a system for docking portable audio devices (fig.2 #40A) to a car stereo (fig.1 #32) wherein the docking stations (fig.1 #38) are positioned in remote locations from the car stereo.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use multiple docking stations placed at various remote locations as disclosed by Miyazaki to dock the portable audio device of Falcon to the car stereo.

The motivation for using multiple remote docking stations in various locations would have been to allow a passenger in the rear of the vehicle to control the audio of the car stereo by placing the portable audio device in a docking station adjacent to the rear seats.

With respect to claim 32, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 30, wherein the base portion comprises a connector for connecting the integration device with the portable device (col.3 ln.43-46).

With respect to claim 35, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 30, wherein the portable device comprises a CD player, CD changer, MP3 player, Digital Audio Broadcast (DAB) receiver, portable video device, or a satellite receiver (col.6 ln.41-47).

With respect to claim 36, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 30, wherein the integration device comprises a circuit board housed in the base portion (col.3 ln.34-40).

It is implicit that the I/O component (#142) would contain a circuit board for the attachment of the disclosed hardware in Falcon column 3 lines 37-38.

With respect to claim 37, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 30, wherein the docking station is mountable in a vehicle trunk (Miyazaki: fig.1 #38).

With respect to claim 39, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the integration device is connected to the car stereo using a bus connection (col.6 ln.37-41).

Claims 2, 11, 16-17, 31 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falcon (US 6,993,615 B2) in view of Miyazaki et al (US 6,163,079) and in further view of Holland (US 2002/0085730 A1).

With respect to claim 2, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 1, however does not disclose expressly wherein the top member is hingedly connected at an edge to the base portion.

Holland discloses an apparatus for docking with a portable device further comprising a top member (fig.2 #5) that is hingedly connected (pg.1 [0009]) at an edge to a base portion (fig.2 #3).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the hinge of Holland in the invention of Falcon.

The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a closeable case that can reduce risks of damage to the portable device while in the docked position.

With respect to claim 11, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 2, however does not disclose expressly wherein the top member is pivotable away from the bottom member to allow access to the portable audio device.

Holland discloses an apparatus for docking with a portable device further comprising a top member (fig.2 #5) that is pivotable away (pg.1 [0009]) from the bottom member (fig.2 #3).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the pivot of Holland in the invention of Falcon.

The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a closeable case that can reduce risks of damage to the portable device while in the docked position.

With respect to claim 16, Falcon discloses the method of claim 15, however does not disclose expressly further comprising providing a top member connected to the base portion and pivotable away from the bottom member prior to inserting the portable audio device into the docking station.

Holland discloses an apparatus for docking with a portable device further comprising a top member (fig.2 #5) that is hingedly connected (pg.1 [0009]) at an edge to a base portion (fig.2 #3), wherein the top member is opened prior to inserting the portable device.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the opening top member of Holland in the invention of Falcon.

The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a closeable case that can reduce risks of damage to the portable device while in the docked position.

With respect to claim 17, Falcon discloses the method of claim 16, however does not disclose expressly further comprising closing the top member to retain the portable audio device in the docking station.

Holland discloses an apparatus for docking with a portable device further comprising a top member (fig.2 #5) that is hingedly connected (pg.1 [0009]) at an edge to a base portion (fig.2 #3), wherein the top member is closed to retain the portable device in the docking station.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the opening top member of Holland in the invention of Falcon.

The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a closeable case that can reduce risks of damage to the portable device while in the docked position.

With respect to claim 31, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 30, however does not disclose expressly further comprising a top member hingedly connected at an edge to the base portion.

Holland discloses an apparatus for docking with a portable device further comprising a top member (fig.2 #5) that is hingedly connected (pg.1 [0009]) at an edge

to a base portion (fig.2 #3), wherein the top member is opened prior to inserting the portable device.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the opening top member of Holland in the invention of Falcon.

The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a closeable case that can reduce risks of damage to the portable device while in the docked position.

With respect to claim 38, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 31, however does not disclose expressly wherein the top member is pivotable away from the bottom member to allow access to the portable audio device.

Holland discloses an apparatus for docking with a portable device further comprising a top member (fig.2 #5) that is pivotable away (pg.1 [0009]) from the bottom member (fig.2 #3).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the pivot of Holland in the invention of Falcon.

The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a closeable case that can reduce risks of damage to the portable device while in the docked position.

Claims 4, 18 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falcon (US 6,993,615 B2) in view of Miyazaki et al (US 6,163,079) and in further view of Byrne et al (US 6,648,661 B1).

With respect to claim 4, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 1, however does not disclose expressly further comprising a cable interconnected at one end to the integration device and at an opposite end to a car stereo.

Byrne discloses an apparatus that is capable of being docked to another apparatus through the use of a cable (fig.1 #15) interconnected between the apparatuses.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the cable of Byrne to dock the portable apparatus and appliance of Falcon.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to move the portable device into various positions while being docked to the appliance. This would give a user more mobility while using the system.

With respect to claim 18, Falcon discloses the method of claim 15, however does not disclose expressly further comprising interconnecting the integration device with the car stereo with a cable.

Byrne discloses an apparatus that is capable of being docked to another apparatus through the use of a cable (fig.1 #15) interconnected between the apparatuses.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the cable of Byrne to dock the portable apparatus and appliance of Falcon.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to move the portable device into various positions while being docked to the appliance. This would give a user more mobility while using the system.

With respect to claim 33, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 30, however does not disclose expressly further comprising a cable interconnected at one end to the integration device and at an opposite end to a car stereo.

Byrne discloses an apparatus that is capable of being docked to another apparatus through the use of a cable (fig. 1 #15) interconnected between the apparatuses.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the cable of Byrne to dock the portable apparatus and appliance of Falcon.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to move the portable device into various positions while being docked to the appliance. This would give a user more mobility while using the system.

Claims 5, 19 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falcon (US 6,993,615 B2) in view of Miyazaki et al (US 6,163,079) and in further view of Northway et al (US 2002/0180767 A1).

With respect to claim 5, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 1, however does not disclose expressly wherein the integration device is wirelessly connected to a car stereo.

Northway discloses a system of integrating two apparatuses through the use of a wireless signal transmitter/receiver device (fig.4 #144, pg.4 [0051]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the wireless communication system of Northway in the communication of the devices of Falcon.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to move the portable device into various positions while in communication with the appliance. This would give a user more mobility while using the system.

With respect to claim 19, Falcon discloses the method of claim 15, however does not disclose expressly further comprising establishing a wireless connection between the integration device and the car stereo.

Northway discloses a system of integrating two apparatuses through the use of a wireless signal transmitter/receiver device (fig.4 #144, pg.4 [0051]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the wireless communication system of Northway in the communication of the devices of Falcon.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to move the portable device into various positions while in communication with the appliance. This would give a user more mobility while using the system.

With respect to claim 34, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 30, however does not disclose expressly wherein the integration device is wirelessly connected to a car stereo.

Northway discloses a system of integrating two apparatuses through the use of a wireless signal transmitter/receiver device (fig.4 #144, pg.4 [0051]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the wireless communication system of Northway in the communication of the devices of Falcon.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to move the portable device into various positions while in communication with the appliance. This would give a user more mobility while using the system.

Claims 10 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falcon (US 6,993,615 B2) in view of Miyazaki et al (US 6,163,079) and in further view of Stark et al (US 2004/0091123 A1).

With respect to claim 10, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 1, however does not disclose expressly wherein the docking station is mountable in a vehicle trunk.

Stark discloses an automobile audio system wherein a control apparatus (fig.1b #22') is mountable in the trunk (pg.4 [0050]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in to mount the audio system of Falcon in the trunk of a vehicle as disclosed by Stark.

The motivation for doing so would have been for applications wherein a primary listening position of a user would be located outside of the vehicle as taught by Stark (pg.4 [0047]).

With respect to claim 23, Falcon discloses the method of claim 15, however does not disclose expressly wherein the apparatus further comprises mounting the docking station in a vehicle trunk.

Stark discloses an automobile audio system wherein a control apparatus (fig.1b #22') is mountable in the trunk (pg.4 [0050]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in to mount the audio system of Falcon in the trunk of a vehicle as disclosed by Stark.

The motivation for doing so would have been for applications wherein a primary listening position of a user would be located outside of the vehicle as taught by Stark (pg.4 [0047]).

Claims 13, 25 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falcon (US 6,993,615 B2) in view of Miyazaki et al (US 6,163,079).

With respect to claims 13 and 40, Falcon discloses the apparatus of claim 1, however does not disclose expressly wherein the car stereo is an Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) or after-market car stereo.

Falcon does disclose wherein the portable device (fig.4 #102) identifies the type of appliance in which it is docked to, for the purpose of communicating with the appliance (col.4 ln.25-42). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the appliance of Falcon could be an OEM car stereo or an after-market car stereo. The motivation for making the appliance an OEM stereo would have been to allow a user to have the functions of the portable device, such as integration with satellite radio, without having to spend money for after-market equipment. The motivation for making the appliance an after-market stereo would have been to allow a user to upgrade their car stereo and still be able to use the portable devices interfacing functions.

With respect to claim 25 Falcon discloses the method of claim 15, however does not disclose expressly further comprising integrating the portable device with an after-market or Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) car stereo.

Falcon does disclose wherein the portable device (fig.4 #102) identifies the type of appliance in which it is docked to, for the purpose of communicating with the

appliance (col.4 ln.25-42). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the appliance of Falcon could be an OEM car stereo or an after-market car stereo. The motivation for making the appliance an OEM stereo would have been to allow a user to have the functions of the portable device, such as integration with satellite radio, without having to spend money for after-market equipment. The motivation for making the appliance an after-market stereo would have been to allow a user to upgrade their car stereo and still be able to use the portable devices interfacing functions.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 7, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the Applicant's arguments labeled "A" on pages 12-14, the Applicant argues that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest providing a remote docking station with an integration device positioned within a base portion of the docking station. The Examiner disagrees with this assertion. To begin, the Falcon reference has not been supplied to teach "remote docking stations", however has been supplied to disclose a docking station comprising a base portion and a bottom member, defining a cavity (col.3 ln.43-55 "receptacle" "recessed portion") for receiving a portable device #102 external to a car stereo #200. From the applicant's present claim language the disclosed "Integration Device" merely integrates a portable device with a car stereo. Falcon's I/O component #142 clearly

anticipates such a limitation (col.3 ln.65-67,col.4 ln.1). When the portable device #102 is docked with the appliance #200 the integration device #142 lies within the base portion of the docking cavity of the appliance #200.

The Applicant continues that the invention of Miyazaki fails to cure the deficiencies of Falcon. The Examiner would like to note that the Miyazaki reference has only been relied upon to show that remote docking stations are well known in the art and it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to locate multiple docking stations (i.e. "recessed portions"), as disclosed by Falcon in various locations in a vehicle, as disclosed by Miyazaki. Such a combination of teachings would provide "a portable device positioned within a base portion of a remotely positioned docking station".

With respect to the Applicant's arguments labeled "B" on pages 14-15, the Applicant argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Falcon with the teachings of Miyazaki et al. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Miyazaki suggests the location of multiple docking stations remotely from a vehicle's control units, such as a stereo and the Falcon

reference provides a portable device that is capable of being removed from a docking station to be used in alternate docking ports.

With respect to the Applicant's arguments labeled "C" on page 15, the Applicant argues that Falcon teaches away from providing a docking station remote from a car stereo. The Examiner agrees with the applicant that the docking station of Falcon is not remote from the car stereo, however the Falcon reference has not been relied upon to teach this feature.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason R. Kurr whose telephone number is (571) 272-0552. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00am to 6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on 571-272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JK

JK


VIVIAN CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2030